



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In November and December many Goshawks appeared at Hadlyme, also many Great Horned Owls; the latter being very commonly heard and seen until into February. The game keeper of a pheasant farm at Hadlyme trapped and killed during the fall and winter up to March 10: 91 Great-Horned Owls; 25 Barred Owls; 15 Screech Owls; 9 Long-eared Owls; and 84 Goshawks, and from September 1916, to March 10, 1918, 74 Red Shouldered Hawks; 60 Cooper's and Pigeon Hawks; and 35 Sharp-shinned and Sparrow Hawks.

The keeper placed eight Horned Owls in a wired enclosure and kept them for some time during the month of January until they began killing and eating each other. This was kept up until only two remained. They were well fed all of the time they were in captivity on dead pheasants killed by other hawks and owls, and Starlings were also shot for them.

The Great Horned Owl has been fast nearing extermination in Connecticut as a permanent resident.—ARTHUR W. BROCKWAY, *Hadlyme, Conn.*

Megaceryle vs. Streptoceryle.—In a paper on the Classification of the Kingfishers (Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 1912), the writer showed that the range of variation in size, form and coloration in the genus *Ceryle*, as commonly recognized, is so great that the two subgenera of the A. O. U. Check-List (1910), *Megaceryle* and *Chloroceryle*, should unquestionably be given generic rank. Working independently, Mr. Ridgway (Bds. N. & M. Amer., VI, 1914, p. 407), treated not only these two groups as full genera but gave equal recognition to *Streptoceryle*, a segregate of *Megaceryle*. The former includes the two American species *M. alcyon* and *M. torquata* and the African *M. maxima*, while *Megaceryle* is restricted to the two closely allied Asiatic species *M. lugubris* and *M. gutturalata*.

Mr. Ridgway separates *Streptoceryle* and *Megaceryle* on account of supposed differences in the form of the bill, relative length of tarsus and inner toe, and coloration. Regarding the character of the feet, I can find no difference whatever, the relative length of the tarsus and toes being remarkably uniform in all the species of the group. So far as general coloration is concerned, the Asiatic species are not essentially different from the African *M. maxima* which connects the former with the American species. In fact, in the markings of the primaries the Old World species are in close agreement with each other, while those of the New World are decidedly different. The coloration of all the forms of *Megaceryle* (*sensu lato*) may be considered of one diversified type as opposed to the different styles of color or pattern seen in *Chloroceryle* and *Ceryle*.

There remains as distinctive of *Streptoceryle* only the form of the bill. This is somewhat more slender, with straighter culmen, the tip of the maxilla more tapering and acute, and the gonys more strongly upcurved. In view of the close resemblance in all other points of structure and the essential agreement in size and coloration, I believe that *Streptoceryle* may profitably be relegated to synonymy. It is significant that Bonaparte in proposing *Streptoceryle* restricted it to the two American species,

torquata and *alcyon*, the African *maxima* being considered a *Megaceryle*. It is a question whether *M. alcyon* is not actually the most distinct species of the genus, differing as it does in its small size, slender bill, and pointed wing, and in certain details of coloration. This fact also weighs against the recognition of *Streptoceryle*.

As further bearing on this question, the case of *Chloroceryle* is worthy of attention. *C. amazona* differs from its three congeners in its distinct crest, nearly even tail, relatively longer second toe, eighteen (instead of fourteen or fifteen) secondaries, and in its larger size. While absolute consistency in our classification is probably impossible of attainment, yet in this particular case the proper course seems clear, namely that if *Streptoceryle* be recognized, then *Chloroceryle* must also be divided. In its coloration, eutaxic wing and scaleless tarsus, *C. amazona* agrees with the three other species of the genus, and as in the case of *Megaceryle*, it seems far better to leave this natural genus intact.—W. DeW. MILLER, *American Museum of Natural History, New York City*.

The Sapsucker Wintering in Central Maine.—Inasmuch as the Yellow-bellied Sapsucker is a bird of evil repute the facts about to be recorded may not be particularly welcome but as the couplet

“In men whom men condemn as ill
I find so much of goodness still,”

may be true also of ‘our little brothers of the air’ I wish to speak a good word for this much maligned bird.

The Sapsucker is a bird which is not common in our locality. Previous to the winter of 1911–1912 I had seen it only rarely, during migrations, the dates being April 17–19 and October 3–5. Therefore I was much surprised on December 11, 1911, to observe one of these birds in our apple tree in company with a Downy. At first I thought it simply a tardy migrant, but when its visit was repeated on the 13th, 14th and 15th of the month, with snow falling on the last day, my curiosity was aroused to see whether it would winter with us. The nearest approach I could find to a statement of its wintering in our latitude was in an article which appeared in the ‘Lewiston (Maine) Journal,’ under date of April 21, 1893, in which the writer says that the Yellow-bellied Sapsucker, “is said to be migratory, but if he is, he frequently stays with us very late and returns very early,” but this statement seems too indefinite to prove the point in question.

My observations were made from the windows of my home and the trees which the bird visited so regularly were sufficiently near to allow most excellent views of him in all positions. He appeared on the 18th, 19th, and 30th of December and on New Year’s Day he spent nearly the entire forenoon in the apple trees near the house, lunching from the frozen fruit which had been left on the trees and hunting over the trunks and branches.

On January 2, he evidently came as soon as it was light and remained until nearly dark, putting in a nine-hour day of hard work without intermission,